DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 853 PS 018 206

AUTHOR Meade, Anne
TITLE Major Policy Developments for Early Childhood Services in New Zealand.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Early Childhood Education and Development (21st, Hong Kong, July 31-August 4, 1989).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Federal Government; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; *Policy Formation; *Systems Development
IDENTIFIERS *New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the problematic aspects of redesigning the administration, organization, and funding of early childhood education in New Zealand. A committee for redesigning early childhood programs in the nation had specified the dimensions of the government's role in supporting early childhood education, and had proposed new arrangements for financial support and program administration. It was intended that the new design would replace all 26 existing funding formulas for grants from the government with one formula. Different services would be treated in the same way. Reaction to the plan was largely favorable, although there were some reservations and queries. In 1989, the government announced a new policy for early childhood care and education, one which differed from the redesign effort on several dimensions, including ownership issues, program monitoring responsibilities, hours of subsidized care, and coverage for special education services. These matters are discussed in detail in sections focusing on: (1) the context for the redesign effort; (2) recommendations of the redesign committee; (3) reaction to the recommendations for the new design; (4) the new policies announced by the government; (5) variation between the committee recommendations and government policy; and (6) public and private ownership issues. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED310853

MAJOR POLICY DEVELOPMENTS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES IN NEW ZEALAND

A paper to be presented at the International Conference
on Early Education and Development (0 - 6 years)
July 31 - August 4 1989
Hong Kong

Anne Meade

PS 018806

New Zealand is in the midst of knitting a new early childhood care and education 'sweater'. In fact, it is in the middle of making a whole new set of educational clothes. What I intend to concentrate on, however, is that sweater (or jersey, as we call them in New Zealand).

I was asked to lead a team of experts to design that new sweater at the beginning of 1988 because there were holes in the old one and, moreover, the sweater no longer covered all of the growing early childhood sector. As I and my colleagues were not going to own this creation, we had to take care that it would fit and suit those who would own it.

When the ten early childhood sector designers and a consultant were half way through their job, the Government released design plans for the ways schools could look in the future. We said to ourselves, if this education system is going to work as a whole we had better make sure that our design coordinates with the schools' design. So some re-thinking was done.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Anne Meade
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

You may ask why did it matter that the early childhood design be coordinated with the school design? The answer is that schools and all early childhood services are under the same government department in New Zealand - the administration of childcare services was transferred to Education administration in 1986 in recognition that the care and education of young children are indivisible.

That move did not mean early childhood services were incorporated into state schools. It was a shift in administrative oversight. The New Zealand Government recognised that preschool education and day care have a shared focus. It closed the gap between preschool education, being administered by the Education Department, and childcare services administered by the Department of Social Welfare. The following year, childcare training was integrated with kindergarten training. These changes acknowledged the truth in the words of Betty Caldwell (1984) "You don't define a service by the number of hours per day it operates."

The changes in 1986 at the time of the transfer of childcare administrative responsibilities could be described as remodelling the old early childhood system. But, it remained shabby in parts, and too small and thin where it needed to be more substantial. However, it was doing better than some other parts of the education system which had been unravelling for years, and had been patched and overstitched so that those parts had become cumbersome.

What our design team aimed to do was keep the features that suited and were comfortable, but to make it of the same quality all over and to make it the right size. Recognising that the early childhood sector is an eco-system, (Mitchell, 1989), we decided upon overall improvements rather than just mending, say, the 'sleeve' for four year olds. The finished product had to be affordable to families and to the Government. To keep the pattern recognisable and comfortably familiar, and to stay within budget, it was agreed that the design would involve keeping the good existing yarn.

Let me move away from allegory and give you an historical context to the changes that will be introduced in 1990.

The context for the redesign

New Zealand has a small population of just over 3 million. Pre-schoolers number 260,220. Most children start school on their fifth birthday, although attendance is not compulsory until age six. They go into the new entrants class of our junior schools.

Approximately 90 percent of 4 year olds and 40 percent of all New Zealand children under age 5 attend an early childhood service - that is relatively high attendance by world standards.

At present, early childhood care and education is provided by over 20 types of organisation which receive some Government support via 26 different funding formulae.

The diversity sounds good, but a range of services does not necessarily equate with choice. The services' differences in funding levels and quality, and the lack of overall planning and coordination have seldom produced choices for parents. In reality, services are often not available at affordable prices where they are needed.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the kindergarten movement in New Zealand, (not part of our state schooling system). By far the largest number of children aged three and four are enrolled in free kindergartens run by community volunteers employing teachers-college-trained teachers. Other services cater for a wider age range. The other main services are playcentres (parent cooperative preschools), private and community kindergartens, nga kohanga reo (language nests for indigenous Maori families), non-profit-making family playgroups, licensed childcare centres, family day care, and Pacific Island language nests to name the most-used forms.

Most early childhood services are community-based, voluntary movements. Some are private enterprise providers - individuals and companies. A few are associated with private schools. The state as direct provider is the exception - it occurs only through the correspondence school and a handful of special pre-school classes attached to state primary schools.

As indicated earlier, the Government gives grants-in-aid to services. Funding has not focussed on "at risk" children, although some targeted assistance goes to low-income families using day care. Grants-in-aid range from loans of equipment to playgroups through to kindergarten teachers' salaries and most running costs. Trainers of early childhood staff also receive Government funding.

In general, much of the diversity has been caused by the varying funding formula used by past Governments. In addition, there has been a demonstrated inability by the established services to adapt to the changing needs of women and families. Change within the services has often been thwarted - by the philosophy and background of the staff and administrators in the different organisations. When a new set of family and early education needs have emerged, the solution to meeting those needs has been to set up a new type of organisation. Existing services have been given few incentives to vary their approach to meeting new needs.

The needs have included:

* children and mothers missing out on even when they seek places

* mothers preferring a parent-cooperative approach

* services for younger children (that is, for infants and toddlers)

* integrated services so that toddlers and preschoolers from the same family can attend at the same place and at the same time

* ethnic groups reacting against what they perceive as colonisation of their children by the majority group

* day care because of the changing role of women

* private school approaches

* alternative educational philosophies such as Montessori and Rudolph Steiner.

For each new organisation, establishment has been followed by a long slow road to negotiating a reasonable level of funding; hence, the varied funding formulae and levels. The present hotch-potch of provision and the distribution of children among them have more to do with historical and locational accidents than the current needs of the children and their families. The families have to fit in with the hours and costs of the services that are available in their locality, if they can gain a place at all. Despite appearances, diversity has not always meant either strength or choice.

The working party set up in 1988 under my leadership concluded that there was no sound social or educational reason why such diverse patterns of availability, accessability and affordability should occur from community to community, or from service to service. It concluded that it was time to redesign the administrative framework to reduce those anomalies.

Recommendations of the Meade Committee

We concluded that the state's role should encompass:

- setting the standards of care and education for young children (through legislation, regulations and the work of officials)

- providing grants-in-aid

- providing training courses for early childhood staff

- supporting community development

- assisting children who have special educational needs and their families, and

- assessing community needs, coordinating services, and planning where to facilitate the establishment of additional services.

New Zealanders accept that Governments will not be the direct provider of early childhood services; but expect a reasonable level of grants-in-aid. Over the last decade, there have been many conferences and committees of inquiry which have consistently supported Government grants going to service providers rather than to families (via such mechanisms as tax rebates or a voucher system). The working party I convened was no exception. Our main reasons were that this approach allows the state the right to insist upon quality controls and to facilitate a planned approach to the distribution of services.

The details of the proposed new arrangements were:

(a) grants based on the same per hour rate per place for all services, (up to a 20 hour weekly limit) provided they negotiated a charter with the Ministry of Education; all early childhood services (sessional/long-day, centre/ home-based, private/community/state could apply;

(b) additional targeted assistance to low income families who could not afford fees;

(c) charters set within a framework of national guidelines based on ingredients and norms that research has shown contribute to quality early childhood care and education. Both the national guidelines and charters would include minimum standards set down in regulation. The regulations would cover centre and home-based providers. The national guidelines would differ in some respect for home-based providers because they would need to include ratios of caregivers per early childhood coordinator;

(d) reviews conducted by officials who would assess compliance with the standards in the regulations as well as progress towards the objectives in the charter;

(e) discretionary grants and loans to assist services with capital costs in getting established;

(f) chartered services to be run by boards of trustees with parents in the majority; (this matched a recommendation for school management committees, and it was felt that parents would be keen to see the money spent on a quality education and would put the brakes on profiteering);

(g) a state-funded support agency, called an Early Childhood Development Unit to provide advisory services, professional and curriculum development activities, and planning and co-ordination functions for the Government. It could earn extra funds by taking on other contracts.

The Government would seldom be the owner of early childhood property. Trustees could either own or rent the accommodation that suited their needs. This was not well-expressed by the report editor and caused a good deal of anxiety and even anger - as I shall describe later;

It was intended that this package would replace all 26 existing funding formulae for grants from the Government. Different services would be treated the same.

The intention was to make funding more equitable. Any group that had a charter approved by the Minister of Education would have access to funds on the same basis as any other service. The charter would give a quality assurance that the service had features known to be associated with good outcomes for young children. The funding formulae was designed to allow (indeed, encourage) providers to diversify services <u>within</u> organisations. It was hoped thereby to facilitate greater stability for children and decrease the incidence of families who "package" several forms of care for their children in any one week.

The criteria for quality would apply across all services and for all age groups (with some additions for infants). The emphasis on quality features was in recognition that there is a close relationship between quality and effects. The benefits sought were developmental benefits for the children - social, emotional, intellectual and physical growth - and family well-being benefits arising from parent involvement and/or parents making a satisfactory contribution to the community and/or labour force. The policy would attend to the best interests of the children, the families and the system.

Ruopp et all (1979, 62-63) outlined three approaches to assessing and ensuring quality:

a) ensuring centres have the right ingredients, (that is, the right knitting yarn),

b) ensuring that the processes, the daily interactions are skilfully handled and appropriate to children's growth, (that is, the knitters skilfully turn the yarn into a good garment), and

c) evaluating the demonstrable outcomes via assessments on the children and obtaining feedback from parents, (that is, checking that the garment has few flaws via manufacturer quality-control checks and by customer report).

My committee's proposals focussed on the first two approaches. There was to be a core of non-negotiable items in the charter to ensure the right ingredients. In addition, many of the negotiable parts of the charter were intended to make the staff reflect more on the goals and on the human interactions that will bring about those goals, (Meade, 1985). For example, the illustrative charter says "The charter should include a statement on curriculum objectives and methods, ... [and] on how staff will continue their learning, ... [and] on how the board will report to parents on the service's achievements and progress, (Meade, 1988, 52-53).

The proposed regular reviews by officials were to ensure that the non-negotiable ingredients were in evidence and that the services were meeting the performance objectives they set down for themselves in their charter.

Reaction to the recommendations for the new design

During the four and a half months between the release of my committee's recommendations and the Government's policy announcements over 1000 submissions were received by the Minister of Education and his colleagues: one for every 260 pre-school child in the country.

Only a small proportion of letters were not supportive of more equitable funding and an improved status for early childhood services. Three percent of submissions called for policies that gave greater recognition to full-time home care for parents.

Reservations and queries centred on:

a) The establishment of boards of trustees to run early childhood services - their composition and role.

b) Protection of conditions of employment and other staff matters.

c) Provision for special needs children.

d) The detail of national guidelines and charters.

e) The detail of funding proposals.

Most community-based services - the majority - supported the idea of boards of trustees to manage centres and schemes with some reservations. However, there was strong opposition from privately-owned service providers who said bluntly that they would not hand over control of their businesses to such bodies. They sought legal interpretations of how Government was going to handle ownership and authority issues, especially where sanctions for managers were threatened. The Government agreed that our

committee had not handled this issue well, as I will discuss in a later section.

The new policies announced by Government

In February 1989, the Rt Hon David Lange, Minister of Education (and Prime Minister) of New Zealand announced the Government's new policy for early childhood care and education in a booklet called **Before Five**. In the announcements, the Minister said that the policies have been built on the existing strengths of services: community involvement and professional expertise. He said that his Government is committed to improving the standards of care and education of young children. Resources put into improving early education was an investment in the quality of life of New Zealand communities and for the future success and well-being of children (Lazar & Darlington 1982; Osborn & Milbank, 1987; and Schweinhart & Weikart, 1980). The individual does better in later life. As well, satisfactory early childhood care and education improves family life and gives women a wider range of opportunities.

The Government's policies stated briefly are:

a) Chartered early childhood services will receive their Ministry of Education funding directly as bulk grants. The amount of the funding was announced on 27 July 1989, (the evening I left home to travel to this conference). The grant will be calculated on the basis of children enrolled per session with a session lasting 2.5 to 3 hours. No service will be funded more than two sessions per day or 30 hours per week. The Minister will be able to approve weightings, for example for children with disabilities. As well, the Department of Social Welfare will assist low income families with a fees subsidy;

b) Discretionary grants will also be available from the Ministry of Education to help services become established. Non profit-making groups will have priority for this assistance, as will groups who can provide little security for a commercial loan;

c) In order to receive funding from the Ministry of Education, early childhood services must negotiate a charter with the Ministry which has been drawn up in consultation with parents and which has been endorsed by them. This charter will be a statement of the service's objectives and practices. It must be in keeping with overall national guidelines for early childhood care and education, and include commitments to conform to safety standards and to supply parent education and support;

d) Services without charters must still be licensed, except in the case of play groups where parents and children meet

together. Parents in "unchartered" centres may still be eligible for a social welfare fees subsidy;

e) Home-based care and education schemes wanting to negotiate a charter will need to be run by a recognised organisation and have a qualified co-ordinator. The homes may be the children's own or another's;

f) All funded services will be accountable for meeting their charter objectives and for the responsible spending of government funds. A review organisation, whose primary function is to check on early childhood service and school charter performance, will check compliance at least once per year;

g) Early childhood services will continue to run with the management structures they have at present. So will property ownership remain as it is already. Where services are provided and fully funded by the state, ownership will be vested in the state, and board of trustees management will be required;

h) An Early Childhood Development Unit will be set up to provide:

- community development activities involving support and advice to families, and to groups and communities which wish to establish home-based and centre-based early childhood services;

- liaison and co-ordination activities across early childhood services;

- in-service training and education across the sector;

- gathering information for planning purposes for the Ministry.

i) Specialists in another agency, the Special Education Service, will support and advise families and services which have children with disabilities. It has been recommended that this service improve its early intervention work and the Government has given it extra resources for that purpose;

j) The registration of early childhood teachers to be voluntary compared with compulsory registration for school teachers.

In sum, the Government has agreed to fund all services - home-based and centre-based - on the same basis. It will not make distinctions between organisations based on their management or ideological differences or on their historical past. In future, funding will depend upon services meeting charter

requirements, and levels will be based on the number of children and sessions per week.

The charter is to be the key to improving quality early childhood care and education in New Zealand so that children do, in fact, experience a better quality of care and education. The charter is a two-way contract: between the service and the community, and between the service and the Government.

The core will be the minimum licence requirements regarding space, buildings safety features, and the ingredients for quality: staff:child ratios, group size, a minimum number of qualified staff, equipment and support services usage. Those seeking a charter and funding will have to contract to do more than the minimum. They must contract to improve their performance on human interacction features which research indicates improves the chances for the future well-being of children such as a planned curriculum, parent involvement and staff development. Advisory support will be required.

You may have noticed the future tense in the preceeding paragraphs. That is because the legislation for these early childhood policies is yet to be introduced into Parliament. It is scheduled for the end of July, while I am attending this conference.

Training will continue to be funded by the Government, but the details of a revised policy are still being worked out.

Commentary

The acceptance of the charter recommendation was no surprise. Government had already committed itself to charters for schools and had indicated it desired the same for early childhood services.

The increases in funding are intended to contribute to increased stability in centres. Staff salaries should increase and, consequently, staff turnover decrease. (I say 'should' because services are not state run and therefore the state cannot fix salaries, although it can affect the wage bargaining environment.) "Packaging" of several services by families to reduce fees payment should become less common when services are more affordable.

Variation between the Meade recommendation and Government Policy

The Government departed from my working party's recommendations in the following ways:

First, the Government did not agree that boards of trustees should run early childhood services. Although that policy has

passed into law for state school governance, the Government chose to treat early childhood services like private schools and to make no requirements as to management structures. That similarity with private schools is not a chance one. As the state does not own private centre's assets, it cannot even threaten to separate the owner-managers from them. Other sanctions are needed.

Second, the Government placed responsibility for the checking of charters with the review agency, not the Ministry of Education. However, it did direct that the approach should be "essentially developmental" (**Before Five**, p.16), thus indicating that assessment of quality would emphasize processes and daily interactions rather than tests of outcomes.

Third, it lifted the "ceiling" for the hours per week the Government would subsidise children from 20 to 30 hours. This recognises the extra costs of operating day care or multi-purpose services compared with sessional services like kindergartens. And, it should reduce fees for those parents and lessen the amount of "packaging".

Fourth, it extended the Special Education Service coverage. It has been directed to add support and advice to families and services with pre-school children with disabilities.

"Ownership" Issues

In the compulsory schooling system the notion of ownership of education is seldom confronted. Education is commonly thought to belong to everyone. In New Zealand that tradition of thought is strong and there are few private schools.

It was demonstrated clearly in the submissions that many providers of early childhood services in New Zealand feel a strong sense of ownership of those services' property. And so they might. A number of centres are run in privately-owned property - even in some rooms of private homes owned by the Supervisor. Our working party recognised that early childhood property ownership differed from state school ownership, but an editing error meant two contradictory statements appeared in the report. The Government was told rather forceably by providers that it could not take possession of private centres in return for improved funding. Government accepted that.

I quote from the Kindercare Submission:

> "Private and voluntary centres cannot give CONTROL of their assets, programme and goodwill to an elected Board of Parents. The recommendations in the report "Education to be More" make it impossible for centres to remain private and viable."

Two other types of rights of ownership are more subtle. I am referring to conventions or codes which are based on collective opinions about the ownership of culture and of knowledge. The two become bound together in curricula.

New Zealand has been confronting the question of ownership of culture in early childhood care and education for several years now, after Maori language nests for the indigenous pre-school children and their families were established in 1982 and multiplied rapidly; (they number over 500 in 1989). From the start, Maori people told non-Maori firmly that they should not interfere in the curriculum and pedagogy of the kohanga reo (language nests) which belonged to Maoridom.

Maori people claimed this and the Government legitimated it. The Government earlier recognised indigenous Maori rights to determine for themselves the way they administer their language nests. It will continue in this way after 1990 by negotiating charters with the Te Kohanga Reo National Trust so that Maori people act as intermediaries between Government officials and Maori families and kaiako (early childhood workers). The Te Kohanga Reo Trust is preparing its own charter frameworks, defined in terms of Maori culture.

Migrant families - in New Zealand they mostly come from the small Pacific Island nations - have not been accorded similar treatment. It seems they will be asked to conform to the standard charter, or receive a lesser grant if they adhere too closely to "their" way. Self-determination within their own culture is not fully accepted for migrant early childhood groups by the Government, although officials have been studying their situation closely in recent months and a change may yet occur before charters are finalised in 1990.

The ownership of knowledge, beliefs and values - intellectual property - has not been worked through fully. It was a looming issue even if there had been no reforms as the Government was beginning to develop national curriculum objectives. But the commitment to charters containing curriculum objectives has cemented the Government's involvement. There have been murmurings of disquiet, but most are reserving their views until the national guidelines and charters framework is released. The Government might be wise to allow a period of debate before this is finalised. The issues have already emerged, (Aitken, 1989). They are:

* who has the ability;
* who has the opportunity;
* who has the authority, and
* who has the power.

Despite the New Zealand playcentre movement operating for four decades as a parent co-operative for all activities, including devising the curricula and training the supervisors,

professionals in other early childhood services have questioned managers and parents' ability to contribute to curriculum planning. The Government has expressed confidence in managers and parents by giving them the opportunity and the authority to have a say. Government, through the review process has the power to enforce this for chartered services.

The charter will state the service's curriculum objectives and methods. The Government's statements are careful but unambiguous.

> "In collaboration with staff and the community, the management of a service will be responsible for charter preparation. The management will ensure that parents are consulted during the preparation of the charter and that parents endorse the charter ... Where there are professional staff, these staff will take the lead in drafting those sections of the charter that deal with curriculum and child-management policies, and in discussing them with parents" [**Before Five**, pp 26-27].

Thus, the professional staff (where they exist), are at the top of the list of those given the legitimate authority to influence the curriculum.

I predict some tensions about this. Kindergarten teachers have been expressing reservations about parents having more say. Some owners of childcare centres believe they have more right than staff to influence the programmes and therefore the minds of "their" young children. Staff in Montessori and Rudolph Steiner pre-schools, who currently monopolise a leading role in their centres, are likely to express concern about the Government's role in setting the framework.

In future, the Government will set the framework, the staff will take the lead and consult parents, and the owner-managers of child care centres will be responsible for drawing it all together for the charter negotiations.

The degree of prescriptiveness will affect the acceptance or denial of the Government's plan. The first draft written by a working party was referred back to officials because it was too prescriptive in the Government's opinion. The new documents are less so.

Nevertheless, there may still need to be a period of accommodation by the key participants. If the documents are given draft-working-paper status, some amendments by the Government should be possible. Even so, many services will have to accommodate to the Government's authority to recognise others' abilities and to allow the state and other parties the opportunity to contribute to curriculum guidelines. The choice is clear - join in the chartering processes which require such participation, or apply for a licence and accept less state

support for less state influence. The delineation of the choice demonstrates that the Government has the power.

The paramount principles of the charter are persuasive. They embrace both the outcomes and the interactions to attain them.

I quote:

> The needs of the child shall be paramount.
>
> All early childhood care and education should enhance the development of the child and support the family.
>
> Early childhood care and education should facilitate the development of self-esteem, confidence, independence and interest in learning of all children.
>
> The curriculum must recognise the varied individual learning characteristics and needs of each child.
>
> Early childhood centres should provide an atmosphere that is warm, accepting and welcoming to both children and adults.

What is interesting is that the Government is silent about the parent education and support programmes required of chartered services. It has exercised no authority vis-a-vis the beliefs and values of this second level of curriculum in early childhood services. Managers have been given the responsibility, but as yet there is no formal guidance on the ability, opportunities and authority issues for parent education. The question therefore remains: Will the Government want to exercise power on these issues at a future date?

Footnote: The views expressed in this paper are those of the author, not of the New Zealand Government.

References:

Aitken, J (1989) Who Owns Schools. An address to the Secondary Principals Association of New Zealand conference, April 1989.

Caldwell, B (1984) What is quality child care?, Young Children, 39, 3, 3-8

Department of Education (1988) Before Five: Early Childhood Care and Education in New Zealand. Wellington: Government Printing Office.

Lazar, I & Darlington, R (1982) Lasting Effects of Early Education: A report from the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 195, 47.

Meade, A (1985) The Children Can Choose. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Meade, A (1988) Education to be More: Report of the early childhood care and education working group. Wellington: Government Printing Office.

Mitchell, A (1989) Old Baggage, New Visions: Shaping policy for early childhood programs, Phi Delta Kappan, May, 664 - 672.

Osborn, A F & Milbank, J E (1987) The Effects of Early Education: A report from the Child Health and Education Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ruopp, R, et al (1979) Children at the Center: Summary Finding and their Implications. Final report of the National Day Care Study, Vol I.

Schweinhart, L J & Weikart, D (1980) Young Children Grow Up: The effects of the Perry Pre-School Programs on Youths through Age 15. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Press.

Smith, A & Swain, D (1988) Childcare in New Zealand. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.